



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/043,038

11/07/2001

Ralph B. Campbell

SUN-P6578-PIP

4604

57960

7590

09/06/2006

SUN MICROSYSTEMS INC.
C/O PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
2820 FIFTH STREET
DAVIS, CA 95618-7759

EXAMINER

MANOSKEY, JOSEPH D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2113

DATE MAILED: 09/06/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/043,038

Applicant(s)

CAMPBELL ET AL.

Examiner

Joseph D. Manoskey

Art Unit

2113

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 August 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5,7-16,18-27 and 29-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5,7-16,18-27 and 29-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 12 March 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-5,7-16,18-27 and 29-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Frey, Jr. et al., U.S. Patent 5,201,044, hereinafter referred to as "Frey" in view of Flemming, U.S. Patent 6,023,772.

3. Referring to claim 1, Frey teaches a file-based transaction system that includes transaction log, this is interpreted as a method for logging file system operation (See Col. 1, lines 9-12). Frey discloses the system performing file transactions using user-inaccessible software and including distributed type of transactions that includes several nodes and each server maintains its own independent log, this is seen as each server as each server has a log file that records all the information of the distributed transactions, which includes the transaction information that occurs on separate servers. This is interpreted as receiving a request to perform a file system operation at a primary server in a highly available system and making a call to an underlying file

Art Unit: 2113

system to perform the file system operation (See Col. 3, lines 22-43 and Col. 5, lines 53-56).

Frey teaches the use of a transaction log file to keep track of the progress of all pending transactions and the log file can be used to reconstruct in case of a failure of the system and Frey discloses the types of transactions including a distributed type of transaction that includes several nodes and each server maintains its own independent log, this is seen as each server has a log file that records all the information of the distributed transactions, which includes the transaction information that occurs on separate servers. This is interpreted as logging the file system operation to a log within a log device to facilitate recovery of the file system operation in the event of a system failure before the file system operation is committed to non-volatile storage, wherein the log device is located on a secondary server that is separate from the primary server in the highly available system and wherein the secondary server acts as a backup for the primary server (See Col. 4, line 53 to Col. 5, line 10 and Col. 5, lines 53-56).

Frey also teaches maintaining transaction data fields which can include the "new" or "modified" data so that a transaction may be "committed" before the base data being modified on the disk and commit means successful completion of the transaction, thus during a failure such a transaction would need to be repeated to be stored on the disk using the "new" or "modified" data in the transaction data field of the log, this is interpreted as wherein the file system operation includes arguments and data needed to repeat the file system operation (See Col. 5, lines 23-29 and Col. 6, lines 5-8). Frey teaches the log file spanning both volatile and non-volatile memory and nearly always

Art Unit: 2113

one portion of the log file will be in the processor's volatile memory, this is interpreted as wherein the locating the log in volatile memory on the secondary server facilitates recovery of the file system operation without adding delay to normal file system operations due to writes to non-volatile storage (See Frey, Col. 3, lines 31-32 and Col. 5, lines 14-16).

Frey does not disclose wherein locating the log on the secondary server facilitates failover to the secondary server when the primary server fails, however Frey does teach the use of a logging system which assures distributed file system consistency in the event of a system malfunction and thus provides for rapid file system recovery (See Col. 3, lines 15-20). Flemming teaches upon the failure of a primary unit, failover occurs to a secondary unit using the contents of a log to update its state (See Col. 11, lines 21-26). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the failover using logs of Flemming with the log recovery system of Frey. This would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to do because the second unit takes over for the malfunctioned primary unit, thus providing a rapid recovery (See Flemming, Col. 11, lines 21-26).

4. Referring to claim 2, Frey and Flemming disclose all the limitations (See rejection of claim 1) including the use unique identification numbers for the transactions in the log (See Frey, Col. 5, lines 34-35).

Art Unit: 2113

5. Referring to claim 3, Frey and Flemming teach all the limitations (See rejection of claim 1) including the use of a commit procedure, this is interpreted as freezing ongoing activity and making a call to the file system to flush memory buffers to non-volatile storage, which guarantees operations are committed to non-volatile storage and later unfreezing ongoing activity (See Col. 5, lines 23-33). Frey also teaches that all old completed transactions are discarded, this is interpreted as removing outstanding file system operations from the log (See Col. 5, lines 11-12).

6. Referring to claim 4, Frey and Flemming disclose all the limitations (See rejection of claim 1) including a recovery procedure that involves reading the log file, this is interpreted as upon a subsequent computer system startup examining the log within the log device (See Frey, Col. 9, lines 38-39). Frey also teaches the log file being used to reconstruct the system, this is interpreted as replaying any file system operations from the log that have not been committed to non-volatile storage (See Col. 5, lines 4-7).

7. Referring to claim 5, Frey and Flemming teach all the limitations (See rejection of claim 1) including defining the sequence of actions to be carried out in the transaction, this is interpreted as checking for dependencies between file system operations and ongoing file system operations, and if detected ensuring completion is done in an order that satisfies the dependencies (See Frey, Col. 5, lines 41-43).

Art Unit: 2113

8. Referring to claim 7, Frey and Flemming teach all the limitations (See rejection of claim 1) including the use unique identification numbers for the transactions in the log (See Frey, Col. 5, lines 34-35), and defining the sequence of actions to be carried out in the transaction, this is interpreted as associating the file system operation with a transaction identifier for a set of related file system operations and wherein logging the file system operation involves storing the file system operation with the transaction identifier to the log device (See Frey, Col. 5, lines 41-43).

9. Referring to claim 8, Frey and Flemming disclose all the limitations (See rejection of claim 1) including logging transactions and defining the sequence of actions to be carried out in the transaction, (See Frey, Col. 5, lines 3-4 and lines 41-43). This is interpreted as determining if the file system operation belongs to a subset of file system operations that are subject to logging and if so, logging the file system operation.

10. Referring to claim 9, Frey and Flemming teach all the limitations (See rejection of claim 8) including subset including operations such as parity update (See Frey, Col. 5, lines 41-43). A parity update will be deferent every time you perform the operation because the data is different, this is interpreted as the operation being non-idempotent.

11. Referring to claims 10 and 11, Frey and Flemming teach all the limitations (See rejection of claim 1) including the log file spanning both volatile and non-volatile memory (See Frey, Col. 3, lines 31-32).

12. Referring to claim 12, Frey teaches a file-based transaction system that includes a transaction log and software for performing the system, this is interpreted as a computer-readable storage medium storing instructions when executed by a computer to perform a method for logging file system operation, wherein the computer-readable storage medium includes one of a volatile memory, a non-volatile memory, a disk drive, a magnetic tape, a compact disc, a digital versatile disc, and a digital video disk (See Col. 1, lines 9-12). Frey discloses the system performing file transactions using user-inaccessible software and Frey discloses the types of transactions including a distributed type of transaction that includes several nodes and each server maintains its own independent log, this is seen as each server has a log file that records all the information of the distributed transactions, which includes the transaction information that occurs on separate servers. This is interpreted as receiving a request to perform a file system operation at a primary server in a highly available system and making a call to an underlying file system to perform the file system operation (See Col. 3, lines 22-43 and Col. 5, lines 53-56).

Frey teaches the use of a transaction log file to keep track of the progress of all pending transactions and the log file can be used to reconstruct in case of a failure of the system and Frey discloses the types of transactions including a distributed type of transaction that includes several nodes and each server maintains its own independent log, this is seen as each server has a log file that records all the information of the distributed transactions, which includes the transaction information that occurs on

Art Unit: 2113

separate servers. This is interpreted as logging the file system operation to a log within a log device to facilitate recovery of the file system operation in the event of a system failure before the file system operation is committed to non-volatile storage, wherein the log device is located on a secondary server that is separate from the primary server in the highly available system and wherein the secondary server acts as a backup for the primary server (See Col. 4, line 53 to Col. 5, line 10 and Col. 5, lines 53-56). Frey also teaches maintaining transaction data fields which can include the "new" or "modified" data so that a transaction may be "committed" before the base data being modified on the disk and commit means successful completion of the transaction, thus during a failure such a transaction would need to be repeated to be stored on the disk using the "new" or "modified" data in the transaction data field of the log, this is interpreted as wherein the file system operation includes arguments and data needed to repeat the file system operation (See Col. 5, lines 23-29 and Col. 6, lines 5-8).

Frey teaches the log file spanning both volatile and non-volatile memory and nearly always one portion of the log file will be in the processor's volatile memory, this is interpreted as wherein the locating the log in volatile memory on the secondary server facilitates recovery of the file system operation without adding delay to normal file system operations due to writes to non-volatile storage (See Frey, Col. 3, lines 31-32 and Col. 5, lines 14-16).

Frey does not disclose wherein locating the log on the secondary server facilitates failover to the secondary server when the primary server fails, however Frey does teach the use of a logging system which assures distributed file system

Art Unit: 2113

consistency in the event of a system malfunction and thus provides for rapid file system recovery (See Col. 3, lines 15-20). Flemming teaches upon the failure of a primary unit, failover occurs to a secondary unit using the contents of a log to update its state (See Col. 11, lines 21-26). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the failover using logs of Flemming with the log recovery system of Frey. This would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to do because the second unit takes over for the malfunctioned primary unit, thus providing a rapid recovery (See Flemming, Col. 11, lines 21-26).

13. Referring to claim 13, Frey and Flemming disclose all the limitations (See rejection of claim 12) including the use unique identification numbers for the transactions in the log (See Frey, Col. 5, lines 34-35).

14. Referring to claim 14, Frey and Flemming teach all the limitations (See rejection of claim 12) including the use of a commit procedure, this is interpreted as freezing ongoing activity and making a call to the file system to flush memory buffers to non-volatile storage, which guarantees operations are committed to non-volatile storage and later unfreezing ongoing activity (See Frey, Col. 5, lines 23-33). Frey also teaches that all old completed transactions are discarded, this is interpreted as removing outstanding file system operations from the log (See Col. 5, lines 11-12).

Art Unit: 2113

15. Referring to claim 15, Frey and Flemming disclose all the limitations (See rejection of claim 12) including a recovery procedure that involves reading the log file, this is interpreted as upon a subsequent computer system startup examining the log within the log device (See Frey, Col. 9, lines 38-39). Frey also teaches the log file being used to reconstruct the system, this is interpreted as replaying any file system operations from the log that have not been committed to non-volatile storage (See Col. 5, lines 4-7).

16. Referring to claim 16, Frey and Flemming teach all the limitations (See rejection of claim 12) including defining the sequence of actions to be carried out in the transaction, this is interpreted as checking for dependencies between file system operations and ongoing file system operations, and if detected ensuring completion is done in an order that satisfies the dependencies (See Frey, Col. 5, lines 41-43).

17. Referring to claim 18, Frey and Flemming teach all the limitations (See rejection of claim 12) including the use unique identification numbers for the transactions in the log (See Frey, Col. 5, lines 34-35), and defining the sequence of actions to be carried out in the transaction, this is interpreted as associating the file system operation with a transaction identifier for a set of related file system operations and wherein logging the file system operation involves storing the file system operation with the transaction identifier to the log device (See Frey, Col. 5, lines 41-43).

Art Unit: 2113

18. Referring to claim 19, Frey and Flemming disclose all the limitations (See rejection of claim 12) including logging transactions and defining the sequence of actions to be carried out in the transaction, (See Frey, Col. 5, lines 3-4 and lines 41-43). This is interpreted as determining if the file system operation belongs to a subset of file system operations that are subject to logging and if so, logging the file system operation.

19. Referring to claim 20, Frey and Flemming teach all the limitations (See rejection of claim 19) including subset including operations such as parity update (See Frey, Col. 5, lines 41-43). A parity update will be deferent every time you perform the operation because the data is different, this is interpreted as the operation being non-idempotent.

20. Referring to claims 21 and 22, Frey and Flemming teach all the limitations (See rejection of claim 12) including the log file spanning both volatile and non-volatile memory (See Frey, Col. 3, lines 31-32).

21. Referring to claim 23, Frey teaches a file-based transaction system that includes a transaction log (See Col. 1, lines 9-12). Frey discloses the system performing file transactions using user-inaccessible software and including distributed type of transactions that includes several nodes and each server maintains its own independent log, this is seen as each server as each server has a log file that records all the information of the distributed transactions, which includes the transaction information

Art Unit: 2113

that occurs on separate servers. This is interpreted as receiving a request to perform a file system operation at a primary server in a highly available system and making a call to an underlying file system to perform the file system operation (See Col. 3, lines 22-43 and Col. 5, lines 53-56).

Frey teaches the use of a transaction log file to keep track of the progress of all pending transactions and the log file can be used to reconstruct in case of a failure of the system and Frey discloses the types of transactions including a distributed type of transaction that includes several nodes and each server maintains its own independent log, this is seen as each server has a log file that records all the information of the distributed transactions, which includes the transaction information that occurs on separate servers. This is interpreted as logging the file system operation to a log within a log device to facilitate recovery of the file system operation in the event of a system failure before the file system operation is committed to non-volatile storage, wherein the log device is located on a secondary server that is separate from the primary server in the highly available system and wherein the secondary server acts as a backup for the primary server (See Col. 4, line 53 to Col. 5, line 10 and Col. 5, lines 53-56).

Frey also teaches maintaining transaction data fields which can include the "new" or "modified" data so that a transaction may be "committed" before the base data being modified on the disk and commit means successful completion of the transaction, thus during a failure such a transaction would need to be repeated to be stored on the disk using the "new" or "modified" data in the transaction data field of the log, this is interpreted as wherein the file system operation includes arguments and data needed to

Art Unit: 2113

repeat the file system operation (See Col. 5, lines 23-29 and Col. 6, lines 5-8). Frey teaches the log file spanning both volatile and non-volatile memory and nearly always one portion of the log file will be in the processor's volatile memory, this is interpreted as wherein the locating the log in volatile memory on the secondary server facilitates recovery of the file system operation without adding delay to normal file system operations due to writes to non-volatile storage (See Frey, Col. 3, lines 31-32 and Col. 5, lines 14-16).

Frey does not disclose wherein locating the log on the secondary server facilitates failover to the secondary server when the primary server fails, however Frey does teach the use of a logging system which assures distributed file system consistency in the event of a system malfunction and thus provides for rapid file system recovery (See Col. 3, lines 15-20). Flemming teaches upon the failure of a primary unit, failover occurs to a secondary unit using the contents of a log to update its state (See Col. 11, lines 21-26). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the failover using logs of Flemming with the log recovery system of Frey. This would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to do because the second unit takes over for the malfunctioned primary unit, thus providing a rapid recovery (See Flemming, Col. 11, lines 21-26).

Art Unit: 2113

22. Referring to claim 24, Frey and Flemming disclose all the limitations (See rejection of claim 23) including the use unique identification numbers for the transactions in the log (See Frey, Col. 5, lines 34-35).

23. Referring to claim 25, Frey and Flemming teach all the limitations (See rejection of claim 23) including the use of a commit procedure, this is interpreted as freezing ongoing activity and making a call to the file system to flush memory buffers to non-volatile storage, which guarantees operations are committed to non-volatile storage and later unfreezing ongoing activity (See Frey, Col. 5, lines 23-33). Frey also teaches that all old completed transactions are discarded, this is interpreted as removing outstanding file system operations from the log (See Col. 5, lines 11-12).

24. Referring to claim 26, Frey and Flemming disclose all the limitations (See rejection of claim 23) including a recovery procedure that involves reading the log file, this is interpreted as upon a subsequent computer system startup examining the log within the log device (See Frey, Col. 9, lines 38-39). Frey also teaches the log file being used to reconstruct the system, this is interpreted as replaying any file system operations from the log that have not been committed to non-volatile storage (See Col. 5, lines 4-7).

25. Referring to claim 27, Frey and Flemming teach all the limitations (See rejection of claim 23) including defining the sequence of actions to be carried out in the

Art Unit: 2113

transaction, this is interpreted as checking for dependencies between file system operations and ongoing file system operations, and if detected ensuring completion is done in an order that satisfies the dependencies (See Frey, Col. 5, lines 41-43).

26. Referring to claim 29, Frey and Flemming teach all the limitations (See rejection of claim 23) including the use unique identification numbers for the transactions in the log (See Frey, Col. 5, lines 34-35), and defining the sequence of actions to be carried out in the transaction, this is interpreted as associating the file system operation with a transaction identifier for a set of related file system operations and wherein logging the file system operation involves storing the file system operation with the transaction identifier to the log device (See Frey, Col. 5, lines 41-43).

27. Referring to claim 30, Frey and Flemming disclose all the limitations (See rejection of claim 23) including logging transactions and defining the sequence of actions to be carried out in the transaction, (See Frey, Col. 5, lines 3-4 and lines 41-43). This is interpreted as determining if the file system operation belongs to a subset of file system operations that are subject to logging and if so, logging the file system operation.

28. Referring to claim 31, Frey and Flemming teach all the limitations (See rejection of claim 30) including subset including operations such as parity update (See Frey, Col.

Art Unit: 2113

5, lines 41-43). A parity update will be deferent every time you perform the operation because the data is different, this is interpreted as the operation being non-idempotent.

29. Referring to claims 32 and 33, Frey and Flemming teach all the limitations (See rejection of claim 23) including the log file spanning both volatile and non-volatile memory (See Frey, Col. 3, lines 31-32).

Response to Arguments

30. Applicant's arguments filed 16 June 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The Applicant argues that Frey does not teach storing the log in volatile memory of the secondary server. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Frey teaches the log file spanning both volatile and non-volatile memory and nearly always one portion of the log file will be in the processor's volatile memory, this is interpreted as wherein the locating the log in volatile memory on the secondary server facilitates recovery of the file system operation without adding delay to normal file system operations due to writes to non-volatile storage (See Frey, Col. 3, lines 31-32 and Col. 5, lines 14-16).

Conclusion

31. This is a continuation of applicant's earlier Application No. 10/043,038. All claims are drawn to the same invention claimed in the earlier application and could have been finally rejected on the grounds and art of record in the next Office action if they had

Art Unit: 2113

been entered in the earlier application. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL** even though it is a first action in this case. See MPEP § 706.07(b). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no, however, event will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joseph D. Manoskey whose telephone number is (571) 272-3648. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. (7:30am to 4pm).


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Beausoliel can be reached on (571) 272-3645. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2113

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JDM

September 1, 2006


ROBERT DEFUSOLIEL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100